



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,404	05/08/2001	Gregory C. Schohn	12481-004001	1878

7590 03/25/2005

Nokia, Inc.
Attn: Ian L. Cartier
313 Fairchild Drive
Mountain View, CA 94043

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/851,404	Applicant(s) SCHOHN ET AL.	
	Examiner James H Blackwell	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment received 11/02/04.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 6 of the specification may require update of the incorporated reference to patent application 09/745,289. Appropriate correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. In particular, page 11, lines 11 and 13 both contain URL's. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the label "Fig. 11" appears on two consecutive pages and labels two different drawings (a table, and a web page). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the

Art Unit: 2176

remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 14, 22, 24-25, 29, and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raghunandan (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 36, 38, 41, and 42), Raghunandan teaches, by way of Example II (Col. 8, lines 61-67; Col. 9, lines 1-67; Col. 10, lines 1-61) a scenario whereby received emails (typically serial in nature), consisting of a number of segments, (*receiving an electronic document represented by serial data*) are reordered while being transmitting to a plurality of recipients depending on the recipient profiles; the recipients then viewing the version of the report in an order that most pertains to sections of the report they are to review (*that contains content of the document and defines an order in which respective portions of the content are to be presented on a display for viewing*). The Example continues to teach a technical report that needs to be sent to three groups of technical reviewers. There are three separate technologies contained in the report each of which is to be reviewed by a separate review team. Raghunandan changes the ordering of the report so that when each team

recipient receives the email, the structure of the report is ordered so that their section appears first (after title, author, etc. segments) (*the reorganization information enabling performance in an order different from the order defined by the serial data*).

Raghunandan teaches recipient profiles that are used to generate how, and in what order the recipients will receive the report (*generating reorganization information for use in delivering the portions of the content*).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Raghunandan teaches that *the reorganization information associates with each of the portions of the content a revised order for presentation* (Col. 8, lines 11-29; Col 9, lines 2-4).

In regard to dependent Claim 22, Raghunandan teaches *analyzing includes identifying one of the portions as containing central content of the document* in that the email system parses the message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2) (Col. 6, lines 41-44).

In regard to dependent Claims 24 and 25, Raghunandan changes the ordering of the report so that when each team recipient receives the email, the structure of the report is ordered so that their section appears first (after title, author, etc. segments) (Col. 9, lines 32-59; compare with Claim 24, “... **moving the central content portion to near the beginning of the document**” and Claim 25, “... **altering the document so that the central content portion appears first when the document is presented**”).

In regard to dependent Claim 29, Raghunandan teaches that *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should be moved relative to other portions in*

generating the reorganization information in that it changes the ordering of the report so that when each team recipient receives the email, the structure of the report is ordered so that their section appears first (after title, author, etc. segments) (Col. 9, lines 32-59)

In regard to dependent Claim 37, Raghunandan teaches *receiving other requests for portions of the content of the document different portions, and in response to the requests, returning other portions of the content using the reorganization information* in that it restructures email messages for transmission to a plurality of recipients by providing transmission control directives and email content segment identifiers supplied by the user, parsing the said directives and email contents, expanding aliases wherever necessary and applying the said directives to restructure the email contents by sending selected segments to selected recipients in identified lists (see Abstract). Hence, if different users have different directives and identifiers as taught above, then the resulting emails will be different.

In regard to dependent Claims 39 and 40, Raghunandan teaches that the *data structure also includes the content, the data being expressed as a modified version of an original data structure that expressed the document* and that *the modified version of the data structure includes annotations* in that in replying to emails that are sent by recipients, the invention can add comments (annotations) from other recipients (Col. 14, lines 30-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raghunandan in view of Moriya (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,140).

In regard to dependent Claims 2 and 3, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the serial data representing the electronic document is expressed in a markup language or that the markup language comprises a hypertext markup language*. However, Moriya teaches that the data storage section (231) stores various documents for supplying to the data terminal (1). Such documents may include HTML documents, e-mail messages and other documents with respect to characters, graphics or sounds (Col. 3, lines 58-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Moriya as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Moriya specifically defines the markup language providing the benefit of a commonly used and tagged language making it easier to identify various parts of the document.

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Raghunandan teaches that the serial data is in an email format (see Abstract).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Raghunandan teaches *the electronic mail format includes a header and a main body* (Col. 10, lines 15-61).

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Raghunandan teaches that *the analyzing includes determining the start of the main body* in that the email system parses the said message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2) (Col. 6, lines 41-44). In doing so, Raghunandan would have identified the main body of the email.

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the hypertext markup language comprises HTML*. However, Moriya teaches that the data storage section (231) stores various documents for supplying to the data terminal (1). Such documents may include HTML documents, e-mail messages and other documents with respect to characters, graphics or sounds (Col. 3, lines 58-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Moriya as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Moriya provides the benefit of various document types.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the markup language comprises PDF, postscript, SGML, PowerPoint, rich text, or unformatted text*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to consider that the email, as taught by Raghunandan, has been historically well known to be written in the form of ASCII, unformatted text. The benefit would have been to make the email readable by most conventional, and many unconventional devices.

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Raghunandan teaches that *the content of the document includes at least one of the following: text, images, tables, frames, and headings* (see Example II). Example II teaches content including text type.

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach *the order in which the respective portions of the content are to be presented includes a two-dimensional layout*. However, Raghunandan does teach a CPU and associated memory, and I/O devices (Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that to effectively interact with a CPU (computer), one would have needed to display the email, providing the benefit of enabling the user to view their reordered email.

Claims 11-13, 19-21, 23, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raghunandan in view of Ma et al. (hereinafter Ma, "A Framework for Adaptive Content Delivery in Heterogeneous Network Environments", copyright 01/2000).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the reorganization information includes an identification of a relative importance of the respective portions of the content*. However, Ma teaches data prioritization in order to distinguish the more important part of the data from the less important part so that different quality of service levels can be provided when delivering the data through the network. For example, we can allow less important data to be dropped under network bandwidth constraints. Or, we can provide progressive delivery to send out the more

important data first (such as low-resolution images) and then deliver the less important data to enhance the information later (such as the reconstruction of high-resolution images). In this way, we can improve the user's browsing experience by efficiently utilizing available network bandwidth. Data prioritization can be achieved within a single media type by using special encoding schemes such as layered coding [9][13] and multi-resolution compression for images [20]. It can also be done across multiple media types by, for example, giving audio higher priority than video and text higher priority than other types of media (Sec. 4.4, 1st paragraph; compare with Claim 11, “... ***the reorganization information includes an identification of a relative importance of the respective portions of the content***”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of prioritizing content for selective transfer of information.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Raghunandan teaches that the email system parses the message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2) based on profiles of the recipients (Col. 6, lines 41-44; compare with Claim 12, “... ***the reorganization information includes an identification of a main block of text***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Raghunandan teaches that the email system parses the said message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2) (Col. 6, lines 41-44; compare with Claim 13, “...

the analyzing includes finding an annotation inserted in the electronic document as a marker of the location of the main block of text"). Raghunandan does not explicitly teach an *annotation marker*. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic mail processing to assume that the email had the standard structure and thus had markers identifying such header information as To:, Cc:, Bcc, etc., and would have therefore been able to, at the very least, offset from those markers to identify the main block of text. The benefit would have been to locate that part of the email that was most likely to need reordering.

In regard to dependent Claim 19-20, Raghunandan fails to teach that *the different order of presentation enabled by the reorganization information is adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance capability than does the performance capability of the display for which the document was originally desired or the more restricted display is part of a mobile phone or personal digital assistant, and the display for which the document was originally designed comprises a desktop computer monitor*. However, Ma teaches that one of the purposes of adapting the content involves the displays of other devices such as PDA's, cell phones, and other Internet appliances that are different from the traditional desktop computer (p. 1, Sec. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of fitting selective information onto a variety of limited devices.

In regard to dependent Claim 21, Raghunandan fails to teach that *presentation of the portions of the content comprises presenting the portions by speech synthesis*. However, Ma teaches Modality Transform that includes speech-to-text and text-to-speech transform (p. 3, Sec. 3.2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of converting a document to assist the vision-impaired.

In regard to dependent Claim 23, Raghunandan fails to teach that the *generating includes inserting a link from near the beginning of the first portion of the content to the beginning of the central content portion*. However, Ma teaches Data Prioritization which has the goal of distinguishing the more important parts of the data from the less important parts (p. 3, Sec. 3.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of prioritizing data so that the most relevant information is sent.

In regard to dependent Claim 30, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the portions that should be moved comprise images or tables*. However, Ma teaches that under Data Prioritization, one could give text higher priority than images, images before audio, and audio before video in considering a delivery pipeline (p. 5, top paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective

transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of modifying content to prioritize it based on conditions.

In regard to dependent Claims 31 and 32, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *analyzing includes identifying regions according to functions* or that *the functions include navigation and content*. However, Ma teaches Purpose Classification which identifies images, logos, or advertisements. Purpose classification of a media object can be done using content analysis techniques. It can also be achieved to some extent by matching URL strings with a pre-established database or via heuristics for associating means with certain text contained in the URLs (pp. 3-4, Sec. 3.5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of identifying various content components.

In regard to dependent Claim 33, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the analyzing includes converting the document to a tree format*. However, Ma teaches that the Document Object is useful data structure to represent the logical structure and contents of a Web page after it is parsed in content adaptation systems. This defines the logical structure and contents of the Web page that is to be adapted. The XML Document Object Model (DOM) [16] technology can be used to represent the hierarchical structure of a Web page, with node elements representing entities such as text, images, audio, and video. By using a Document Object Model to represent Web page structure, we can to perform a number of document-level adaptations to the Web

page. This complements the component level adaptations that we implement, such as image scaling and video modality transform. By analyzing the contents of the Web page as a whole, we can optimize the adaptation process by identifying redundant information that can be removed from the Web page without overly compromising the informational integrity of the Web page. This page-level adaptation can be considered to be a "re-authoring" of the content [4] (Sec. 5, right column, paragraphs 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of a tree view, making it easier to identify different types of content.

In regard to dependent Claim 34, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *the analyzing includes blocking major regions of the document*. However, Ma teaches blocking advertisement images by matching URL strings with a list of keywords like "ad", "banner", "advertisement", "promotion", or a list of known advertising web hosts (p. 4, top paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Ma as both inventions relate to selective transfer of data. Adding the teaching of Ma provides the benefit of removing content based on specifications.

Claims 15-17, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raghunandan.

In regard to dependent Claims 15 and 16, Raghunandan does not teach that *the reorganization information includes a hyperlink to be displayed near the beginning of the document, the hyperlink pointing to a portion of the content that appears later in the original order or the hyperlink is included only if the location of the hyperlink in the document is separated by at least a predetermined distance from the location to which it points*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of web page construction at the time of invention because this is one of many techniques used to assist the user with web page navigation (also known as a targeted link). The benefit of such a link would have been to take one to a specific location within a hypertext document (e.g., to find a section of the document that is off the screen).

In regard to dependent Claim 17, Raghunandan does not teach the *reorganization information causes an automatic redirection from the first portion of the content to a later portion of the content when the document is opened for presentation*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of web design at the time of invention to have used a HTML META command of the type `<meta http-equiv="refresh" content="0; URL=http://<a relative link would go here">`. The benefit would have been to redirect the user from one location on the web page to a different location on the same or a different web page, making it easier to find the correct information.

In regard to dependent Claim 35, Raghunandan does not specifically teach *the analyzing includes counting characters of text*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to count characters of text

providing the benefit of having determined the character lengths of portions of text in the document in order to compute what text will fit on a given display.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raghunandan in view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947).

In regard to dependent Claims 26-28, Raghunandan fails to explicitly teach that *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be separated in generating the reorganization information* or that *the portions that should not be separated include at least one of the following pairs: heading and text, image and caption, or that paragraph and related paragraph* or *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be moved relative to other portions of the document*. However, Kanevsky teaches that another criteria for making priority decisions in order to determine what and how to display web objects is the dependencies associated with these objects. For instance, assume that an object O1 is dependent on an object O2, if one of the following conditions are fulfilled: (1) every item (or most of the items) in O2 can be accessed from O1, meaning that if object O1 is activated (e.g., by clicking a mouse on O1) then, among other things, objects that are accessible from O2 are displayed; (2) items that are accessed from O1 contain most of the information that is described in items that are accessed from O2; and (3) items that are accessed from O1 refer in some way to information that is contained in items that are accessed from O2, for example, items in O1 are titles or abstracts of articles in O2. Other criteria of dependencies, for example, indicated in cookies, can be chosen by

Art Unit: 2176

users (Col. 11, lines 64-67; Col. 12, lines 1-12). In addition, Kanevsky teaches that in the block 901, objects that contain or point to information with the same or similar topics are combined into one set. An icon or button is created on an adapted web page that is linked to the combined data. A new name is chosen to characterize the combined data. This name is written (or expressed graphically via some symbol) on an icon or a button. For example, in Fig. 13, a typical part of a Yahoo entry panel to news is shown (block 1501). In block 1501, a first word on each line defines a topic of subsequent links (underlined words). For example, the word BUSINESS in the first line defines the content of links Headlines, Summaries, etc.; the word TECHNOLOGY in the second line defines the content of subsequent links in this line, and so on (Col. 14, lines 15-28). Kanevsky also teaches that the semantic interpreter module 905 separates objects on web pages that refer to different topics and combines (unifies) objects that refer to the same or similar subjects. These semantic operations are based either on instructions of web designers or may be performed automatically. The overall module 905 provides semantic interpretations of web objects that are needed for block 901. Semantic interpretations in block 901, for example, may define what objects are semantically close (i.e., have similar topics), what part of a link definition is relevant to a topic, etc (Col. 14, lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Raghunandan and Kanevsky as both inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of Kanevsky provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to independent Claim 1 (and similarly 36, 38, and 41-42), and their dependents have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system: Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
03/16/05


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER